

ACK
NEX

5

Isaiah's Parable of the Vineyard



By PAUL HAUPT
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Reprinted from

**THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC
LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES**

(Continuing "HEBRAICA")

VOLUME XIX, NO. 4

JULY, 1903



THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(CONTINUING "HEBRAICA")

VOLUME XIX

JULY, 1903

NUMBER 4

ISAIAH'S PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD.

BY PAUL HAUPT,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Cheyne says in his notes on Is. 5, in *The Polychrome Bible*, that 'the Parable of the Vineyard takes the form of a song. The prophet assumes the character of a popular singer. If he accompanied his song with music, he must have changed his note at v. 3, and what an effect must have been produced when in the middle of a sentence (v. 6) he suddenly passed out of the lyric into the grave prophetic rhythm, and became no longer a singer but an orator.' These remarks are evidently based on Duhm's commentary.* Duhm's analysis of the poem has been adopted also by Marti.† Duhm thinks that there is a different rhythm from וְעַלְהָ שְׁמֵיר וּשְׁרִתָּה on; but this clause is a gloss, and the following lines exhibit the same rhythm as the preceding stanzas. In his *Introduction*‡ Cheyne says that vv. 1–7 are in two distinct rhythms or meters; the division is at v. 6^c, when Isaiah, in the midst of his threatening prophecy respecting the vineyard, suddenly exchanges the light, dancing, popular rhythm for a heavy prophetic parallelism.

Ewald|| arranged only the first two verses in lines, evidently thinking that the rhythm in the following verses was different.

* First edition, Göttingen, 1892; second edition, 1902.

† *Das Buch Jesaja* (Freiburg i. B. 1900), p. 55.

‡ *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (London, 1895), p. 23.

|| *Jesaja*² (Göttingen, 1867), p. 306.

In Hitzig's translation of the poetical books of the Old Testament, on the other hand, the whole poem is printed in lines.* In Kautzsch's *Textbibel* (1899) the second half of v. 5 and vv. 6. 7 are printed in lines, but not the preceding verses. Cersoy,† on the other hand, thinks that the first two verses were borrowed by Isaiah from a popular song, but that the following verses are not metrical. If we look at Sievers'‡ arrangement of the poem we can easily see how a commentator may arrive at the conclusion that vv. 3-7 are not metrical; for there is apparently no regularity whatsoever. But if the song is freed from superfluous scribal expansions the meter is the same from the first verse to the last.

There is no change of rhythm in the poem. This parable consists of four|| stanzas; each stanza is composed of four בְּשָׁלָמָן § with two beats in each hemistich. Each of the first three stanzas comprises two Masoretic verses, while the last stanza is represented by v. 7. The text of the first three stanzas is on the whole correct but considerably expanded; in the last stanza, on the other hand, we find an omission and a corruption. The scribal expansions are all such as we frequently meet with in other texts of the Old Testament.

I would arrange the Hebrew text as follows : **

* *Die poetischen Bücher des AT* (Leipzig, 1854); so, too, in Hendewerk's *Jesaja*, part 1 (Königsberg, 1838), p. 129, and in Umbreit's commentary (Hamburg, 1846).

† *L'apologue de la Vigne au chapitre Ve d'Isaïe* in the *Revue Biblique* (Jan. 1899), pp. 3-12 (cited in Marti's commentary, p. 55). Cf. ZA 9, 361.

‡ *Metrische Studien* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 434.

|| Ernst Meier in his commentary (Pforzheim, 1850) divided the poem into two stanzas: vv. 1-4 and 5-7.

§ See my paper on The Poetic Form of the First Psalm in *HEBRAICA*, 19, 137, n. 15. The four double-hemistichs of each stanza may be grouped in two couplets.

** The arrangement of Hebrew poetic texts in double-hemistichs, in two columns, which I introduced in part 15 (Proverbs) and 4 (Numbers, cc. 21. 23. 24) of *The Polychrome Bible*, is found in certain Hebrew MSS, e. g., in the Sephardic MS, British Museum, Oriental 2201. In this beautiful quarto MS, which is one of the oldest dated copies of the entire Hebrew Bible, having been written at Toledo in 1246 A. D., the three poetical books, Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, are written in double-hemistichs, in two columns. A collotype facsimile reproduction of folio 283^a (containing Ps. 106, 23^b-107, 32) of this MS is given on plate ix of the Series of XV Facsimiles of MSS of the Hebrew Bible published by James Hyatt (London, 1897). Ginsburg says in his description of this plate, 'The three poetical books are arranged in prescribed lines,' whatever that may mean; see also Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Masoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London, 1897), p. 675; cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 517. 729. Ginsburg's remarks are unfortunately not sufficiently clear (*cf. op. cit.*, pp. 591. 598. 606. 667). Cf. also the Cod. Or. Gaster. 151 described in *PSBA* 22, 234.

שירת הכרם לישעיהו

I	<p>1 אֲשִׁירֵה־פָּא לִדְיִךְ שִׁירָתְךָ כֶּרֶמוֹ כֶּרֶם^g לִדְיִךְ בְּקָרְנוֹ בְּוַיְשָׁמֵן:</p> <p>2 וַיַּעֲזַבְךָ וַיַּסְכַּלְךָ רַטְעָהוּ שָׂרָק וְגַסְיָקָב חַצְבִּיבָּוּ: רַבֵּן מַגְדָּלִי</p>
II	<p>3 יֹשֵׁב יְרוֹשָׁלָם שְׁפֵטָרָנָא בֵּין וְאִישׁ יְהוָה וּבֵין כְּרָמֵי:</p> <p>4 מִהְדַּלְעָשָׂות עָדוֹת וְלֹא עַשְׂיוּרָבוּ וַיַּעֲשֵׂה בָּאָשָׁים:</p>
III	<p>5 אֲוֹדִיא־הַדָּא אֲתָכֶם אֲתָד־אֲשֶׁר־אָנָּי עַשְׂתָּה וְהִיה לְבָעֵר^a:</p> <p>6 וְאֲשִׁירָה בְּקָה וְלֹא יַעֲרֵר^b מִהְמַטֵּר עַלְיוֹן:</p>
IV	<p>7 כִּי־כָרְמֵת יְהוָה^c וְאִישׁ יְהוָה נְסֻעַ שְׁעוֹרָיו^d</p> <p>וְיַקְרֵב לְמִשְׁפָט וְהִנֵּה מִשְׁחָת וְהִנֵּה צַדְקָה:</p>

(a) 2 בתוכו

(b) היה

1 (a) דוד

- (c) 2 רַיְקָר (לעשות) עֲנָבִים וַיַּעֲשֵׂה בָּאָשָׁים
(d) 3 רַעֲתָה (e) 4 לְכָרְמֵי (f) מִדְרָע (g) עֲשָׂוָת (h) 5 רַעֲתָה (i) לְכָרְמֵי
(j) 6 לֹא יוֹמֵר (k) רַעֲלָה שְׁמִיר וְשִׁית (l) עַל (m) מַטָּר (n) צְבָאָה

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE TEXT.

- (1) פָּנָא (cf. Gesen.²⁷, § 105, b, n. 3) in אֲשִׁירְדָּפָא is enclitic; the preceding אֲשִׁירָה should be accented on the ultima, not on the penult; so, too, הַצְבֵּבָר (v. 2), עַשְׂיָהָרָב (v. 4), אֲוֹדִיעָדָפָא (v. 5).

פָּנָא does not mean *to my friend* (AV, *to my well beloved*; RV, *for my well beloved*) or *in honorem Dei quem maxime diligo cantabo* (Grotius). Nor can the prefixed לְ be taken as the לְ *auctoris* (cf. Bachmann's explanation cited below), although in v. 3 the friend to whom the vineyard belongs is introduced as the speaker. The preposition לְ means here *of* (so RVM), that is, *concerning*, as in Ps. 3, 3: רַבִּים אָמַרְתִּים לְנֶפֶשִׁי Many there are who say of me and in Gen. 20,13: אָמַרְתִּילְךָ אֶחָד הוּא Say of me, He is my brother. This לְ is not a popular shortening of אלְ, as Duhm supposes; in his commentary on Ps. 3,3 Duhm says, is a poetic equivalent of עַל־נֶפֶשִׁי. Nor can we read, with Bachmann,* אלִידִידָרִי (*haplography*). Cf. Gesen.²⁷, § 119, u.

פָּנָא may be a misplaced variant to לִידִידָרִי in the first hemistich. ס has سְמֻכָּה for both יְדִידָרִי and דְּרוּדָרִי. פָּנָא is certainly not an abbreviation for דְּרוּדָם (Lowth, Cheyne, Budde,† Marti, as an alternative); this parable is no love-ditty (contrast Crit. Notes on Isaiah, SBOT, p. 117, l. 37, and Ginsburg's *Introduction*, pp. 793, 820). Cersoy points, שִׁירָה דְּרוּדִי *my love-song*, and Marti is inclined to adopt this emendation as the simplest solution of the difficulty. Bachmann proposes to read שִׁירָה־דְּרוּד = שִׁירָה־כְּרָמִי. According to Winckler, AoF (= *Altorientalische Forschungen*), 1,341 (1896), the opening lines of the poem should be taken to mean: I will sing to my god a song of my god, concerning his vineyard. My god had a vineyard, &c. He believes that דְּרוּד or דְּרוּד means δαίμων (Dido=δήδηδαίμων) and is inclined to substitute לְרוּדָרִי for פָּנָא or לִידִידָרִי in the first and third hemistichs of the opening couplet.

After the insertion of שִׁירָה־כְּרָמִי between דְּרוּד it was necessary to prefix לְ to כְּרָמִי (G^V τῷ ἀμπελῶνι μου = לְכְרָמִי) is influenced by glosses ζ and κ).

Omit פָּנָא after הַזִּיה; the vineyard still belongs to the friend; he tells the men of Judah in v. 5 what he purposed to do with it. The addition of הַזִּיה was probably suggested by כְּרָמִי in 1 K 21,1; cf. my notes on Cant. 8,11 (*The Book of Canticles*, p. 60 = HEBRAICA, 19, 6).

There is hardly any paronomasia between כְּרָמִי and קְרָנִי as Duhm supposes; קְרָנִי and כְּרָמִי are entirely different consonants. Nor is this case recorded in Dr. Casanowicz's dissertation on Paronomasia in the OT (Boston, 1894). There is just as much assonance between

* *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen* (Berlin, 1894), p. 64.

† *New World*, March 1893, p. 49.

כֶּם and שֶׁמֶן, *viz.* only one consonant and the vowels are identical.

בְּקָרְבָּן שֶׁמֶן and Bachmann's emendation בְּקָרְבָּן נִידְשֶׁמֶן are not good. Nor need we read, with Kennedy, שֶׁמֶישׁ instead of שֶׁמֶן; see, however, my remarks on בְּעַלְ-חַמּוֹן, or rather שֶׁמֶן, in Cant. 8,11 (*The Book of Canticles*, p. 33, n. 3). In his *Critica Biblica* (London, 1903), p. 10, Cheyne proposes to read בְּקָרְבָּן בְּנֵי שֶׁמֶעָלָן. The reference, Cheyne adds, is not to the Cimmerians but to the North Arabians. I prefer the received text. סְנָאָתָן, מְמֻנָּדָן; cf. ἐν κέρατι, ἐν τόπῳ πίστι. שֶׁמֶן is more poetic than the adjective שֶׁמֶן, but it is not chosen on account of the meter; שֶׁמֶן would have suited the meter just as well.¹ Contrast my note on Cant. 1,6 in *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 31, n. 13 = HEBRAICA, 18, 221.

- (2) For שְׁרָק cf. Jer. 2,21; Gen. 49,11 and Abulwalid's explanation quoted in Gesenius' *Jesaja*, part 1 (Leipzig, 1821), p. 231 (repeated in his *Thesaurus*): هو أجرد الکرم ويقال له السریق ويكون بالشام. GT (i. e., *Fragmenta rescripta Tischendorfiana Isaiae prophetae*) has ἀμπελον σωρηκ, 3 electam, שֶׁמֶשׁ vines. A good German equivalent would be *rother Gutedel*. Winckler, AoF 1, 350, proposes to read נָתַת instead of מְנַדֵּל; but cf. Mark 12,1.

הַחֲנוּ is a superfluous scribal expansion.

וַיַּקְרֵב לְעֵשֶׂת עֲנָבִים וַיַּעֲשֵׂת בְּאָשִׁים מִשְׁלֵל of v. 3, and שְׁרָק of v. 4, is a scribal expansion derived from the second מִשְׁלֵל of v. 4. Both there and in the present gloss שְׁרָק represents a subsequent addition; cf. וַיַּקְרֵב לְמִשְׁפָט (v. 7^e) and 59,9.11. 3 inserts *ut faceret* not only in vv. 2,4 but also in v. 7: *et expectavi ut faceret judicium*. The expression וַיַּקְרֵב לְעֵשֶׂת עֲנָבִים, without an indication of the different subject of עֵשֶׂת, is illogical; שְׁרָק is generally supposed to mean, *He (my friend) expected that it (the vineyard) would bear grapes* (שְׁמַךְ, תְּשַׁמֵּךְ); but this would require at least the insertion of לְ.

וַיַּקְרֵב לוּ לְעֵשֶׂת עֲנָבִים, לְרַעַת בְּאָשִׁים see my remarks in HEBRAICA, 19, 138, n. 20.

For شְׁרָק (3 labruscae, French *lambrusque*) cf. Gesenius' *Jesaja*, part 1, p. 233; part 2, p. 364, and ZDPV 1888, p. 160 (cited by Marti).

- (3) שְׁרָק at the beginning of stanzas II and III (vv. 3, 5) is due to scribal expansion. שְׁרָק transposes יְהוָה and יְשָׁב יְרוּשָׁלָם; cf. my remarks on the Syriac version of Ps. 1 in HEBRAICA, 19, 137, n. 16 and below, n. 5 of the Explanatory Notes on p. 201.

(4) מִלְכָרְבֵנִי is a superfluous addition both here and at the end of the first מִשְׁלֵל of stanza III (v. 5).

מַיְהֹעַ is a scribal expansion. Logically it does not belong to the first hemistich, but to the second: Why, when I had a right to expect good grapes, did it bear worthless, small, sour berries? so correctly ARV and Hendewerk (see above, p. 194, n. *), p. 133; contrast Ernst Meier (see above p. 194, n. ||), p. 49.

לְעַנְבִּים instead of עַנְבָּה in מַיְהֹעַ see the note on gloss δ (v. 2).

(5) Omit מַיְהֹעַ as at the beginning of v. 3.

The rhythm of the second hemistich would perhaps be improved by transposing מַיְהֹעַ; in this case we should have to read: אָנָּי עֲשָׂה אָנָּי אֲחַד-אָשֶׁר עֲשָׂה-אָנִי being enclitic; cf. the notes on v. 1.

מִשְׁוְכָתָה for מִשְׁוְכָתָה. ס has مִשְׁוְכָתָה for מִשְׁוְכָתָה just as in v. 2 for מַיְהֹעַ.

פַּרְץ גָּדוֹר וְהִזְהָר לְמִרְמָס is a gloss (or variant) to the preceding מִשְׁלֵל; it may have been suggested by Hos. 2,8. Cf. my notes on Cant. 3, 8, 10; 4, 14 (see my *Book of Canticles*, p. 23, n. 14; p. 49, n. 49), also my note on Ps. 45, 16 in HEBRAICA, 19, 136.

(6) For מַיְהֹעַ point בְּתַחַת, Arab. بَتْ بَقْهَة, from بَقْهَة, Arab. *to cut* (قطع), vii to be cut off, decided, ended (انقطع); Assyr. buttutu 'to end' (Delitzsch, HW 192b). Arab. قطع means also to exterminate, to annihilate; cf. Heb. נִכְרָת and הִכְרָת, especially Gen. 41,36: חִפְרָת הָאָרֶץ בְּרֻעָב. Bachmann proposes to read, following קָאַל אָנִיְשָׁו τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου, בְּדַד (cf. 27,10).

וְלֹא יַעֲדֶר מַיְהֹעַ is a scribal expansion of the following מַיְהֹעַ; so, too, מַיְהֹעַ שְׁמִיר וְשִׁית; cf. 7,23; 9,17; 10,17; 27,4. With the exception of 9,17 all those passages are post-Isaianic.

Bachmann proposes to read עַלְלה instead of מַיְהֹעַ, following ΕΤ καὶ ἀναβήσονται (var. ἀναβήσεται), 3 et ascendent vepres et spinae, ס עַלְלה סְבִיר וְשִׁית; cf. Assyr. elū 'to grow up' (Delitzsch, HW 61a, 4). Bachmann thinks that שְׁמִיר וְשִׁית does not stand in the accusative (Ges.²⁷, § 117, z) but is the subject of עַלְלה. The clause עַלְלה שְׁמִיר וְשִׁית should therefore be translated, not: It shall shoot up in thorns and briars (so Cheyne in SBOT), but: There shall come up briars and thorns (so ARV). I believe, with Bachmann, that שְׁמִיר וְשִׁית is nominative, not accusative; but if the verbal predicate precedes the subject, the plural is not necessary; cf. Ges.²⁷, § 145, o. In Prov. 24,31 the meter requires not only the omission of the superfluous third hemistich פֶּפֶר פִּיו חֲלִילִם (see SBOT *ad loc.*) but also the excision of עַלְלה, so that עַלְלה קְמַשְׁיִם פֶּפֶר may be explained in the same way as עַלְלה שְׁמִיר וְשִׁית, i. e. may be verbal predicate to קְמַשְׁנִים. Prov. 24,30-34 must be read as follows:

30	עַל-טוֹהָא אִישׁ-עַצֵּל עֲבָרִתִי
31	וְהַנֶּה עַלְהָא קְמַשְׁנִים ⁸
32	וְגַדְרָא אַבְנֵי נַחֲרָה :
33	רָאִיתִי לְקֹחָתִי מַוְסֵּר :
34	מַעֲטִידְבָּוק יְדִים לְשַׁכֵּב :
	וְבָא כְּמַדְלָךְ רִישָׁן וְמוֹהָסָרָךְ כָּאִישׁ מַעַן :

(7) אָנוֹנוֹ

31 בְּפָרְיוֹ פְּנֵיו חֲרָלִים

כָּלֹן 30 (a)

Also in Is. 34,13 we had better read:

וְעַלְהָא בְּאַרְמָנָתִיהָ סִירִים קְמַרְשׁ וְחוֹזֵה בְּמַבְצָרִיהָ

וְעַלְהָא is due to **וְהַיְתָה** at the beginning of the following line. In Is. 32,13 is Hif'il (= **חַצְמִיחָה**); cf. my remarks in my paper on The Beginning of the Judaic Account of Creation in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 17, 158 (1896).

Omission of **וְעַלְהָא** improves the rhythm.**מִטְרָה** at the end of this verse is a superfluous scribal expansion.(7) Syntactically **כְּרָם יִצְחָזֵק** is predicate, and **בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל** subject.**צְבָאוֹת** is scribal expansion. It is canceled also by Sievers.**מִשְׁפָחָה** seems to be a corruption of **מִשְׁחָת** = **מִשְׁחָת** (in Is.52,14 it is better to read **מִשְׁחָת** instead of **מִשְׁחָת**); cf. Heb.(דְּרָכָיו) **הַשְׁחִיתָה** (**דְּרָכָיו**); Eth. **סְהִתָּה**: *səh̥ta*, to err, to sin; **סְהִתָּת**: *səh̥tat*, error, sin; **סְהִתָּה**: *sah̥ṭa*, to hurt, to injure; Syr.**שְׁסָדֵם** corruption, destruction; Arab. **سُخت** *suh̥t*, corrupt practice, undue profit, unlawful gain (**إِكْتَسِبَ السُّخْتَ**). Theinstead of **תְּ** is due to the influence of the preceding **תְּ**, just as**כְּ** is not unfrequently changed into **צְ** under the influence of an adjacent **תְּ**; cf. **פָּסָחָה** = **פָּסָחָה** = Assyr. *puššuxu*, to appease, seenote 60 of my paper on Babylonian elements in the Levitic Ritual (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, 19, 73) and KAT³ 610, n. 3. In thesame way we might combine Heb. **צְמַח** to sprout with Assyr. *šamāxu* (Delitzsch, HW 669^b). In Ges.-Buhl¹³, on the other hand,Assyr. *šamāxu* is combined with Heb. **תְּבִשָּׂה** to rejoice and Arab.**شَمَحْ بَأْنَفَه** (**عَلَا وَطَال**) to be high or to be proud;cf. Lat. *lucus laetissimus umbrae*, &c., and l. 8 of the fifth tabletof the Babylonian Nimrod* Epic (p. 24 of my edition): *ṭābu* *cillašu* || *mali* *rīšāti*; cf. Delitzsch, HW 607^b and Jensen'sinaccurate translation in Schrader's KB 6, 161 (*ihr guter Schatten*

* Cf. my remarks in the Critical Notes on Proverbs (SBOT), p. 33, l. 17. It might be well to state in this connection that I never believed that Nimrod was identical with the Kassite ruler *Nazimara ddaš* (see Cheyne-Black's *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 3418); I only suggested, nineteen years ago, that the name Nimrod might be a contraction of *Nazimara ddaš*; see my paper in the *Andover Review*, July, 1884, p. 94; cf. KAT³ 581.

ist voll 'Jauchzens;' this would be ցillašu ṭabu rišati malı; ṭabu is, of course, predicate to ցillašu); cf. my remarks on Jensen's translations in my paper on The Beginning of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 22, p. 9; see also vol. 16, p. cx, and Critical Notes on Proverbs (SBOT), p. 60, l. 39.

We might also read מִשְׁחָד bribery, but מִשְׁחָת is preferable; in the first place the paronomasia between מִשְׁחָת and מִשְׁפָּט is more striking, and then the corruption of מִשְׁחָה to מִשְׁחָת is more easily explained: the last two consonants of מִשְׁחָת were transposed, and שׂ was miswritten ח. Siegfried-Stade, s. v. מִשְׁחָה, suppose that this word was coined by the prophet for the sake of the paronomasia with מִשְׁפָּט. Even if מִשְׁחָה were correct, it could not mean *bloodshed*, although Arab. سفاح means *shedding blood, tyrant* (أَرْاف = سفاح). For שְׁפָּה we should expect شְׁפָּח. Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 705^b, thinks that the שׂ in מִשְׁפָּה was substituted for ח. Ges.-Buhl¹³ compares مشفع mušaffah, *thwarted, unsuccessful*; cf. Assyr. sapāxu, *to annihilate, break up, destroy* (Delitzsch, HW 507^b). In note 80 of his dissertation on Paronomasia in the OT (1894) Dr. Casanowicz suggested that מִשְׁפָּח might be a transposition of מִשְׁחָה = Assyr. saxāpu, *to overthrow*; but we expect a word for *injustice, corruption* (ἀνομία, *I iniquitas*). Cheyne's מִשְׁחָה is impossible.

Before מִשְׁחָה in the last line of the poem the rhythm requires the insertion of a verb, either יִקַּרְאֶה, as in the preceding line, or וַיַּזְהֵל, or וַיַּזְהַב, although this form does not occur in the OT.

It is not impossible that the original text read וְהַפְּנֵה לְמִשְׁחָת and וְהַפְּנֵה לְצַדְקָה in the second hemistichs of the last two lines; cf. Hagg. 1,9: פְּנֵה אֱלֹהִים־רַבָּה וְהַפְּנֵה לְמִיעֵד; see note 3 of my lecture on the Book of Ecclesiastes in *Oriental Studies* (Boston, 1894), p. 264; cf. Ges.²⁷, § 143, e; § 114, i, note 1; Wright-de Goeje³, 2, 79.

This Isaianic poem may be translated as follows:

PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1 I will sing of my friend, now,
My friend has ^β a vineyard | a song of ^a his vineyard: ¹
on a spur that is fertile. ² |
| 2 He hewed it and cleared it, ³
He built (there) ^y a tower ⁵ | and planted choice vines ⁴ (there);
and hewed out ⁶ a wine-vat. ^δ |

(α) 1 my dear one of

(β) had

(γ) 2 in the midst of it

(δ) 2 he looked for it to bear (choice) clusters,—it bore sour berries!

II 3 Ye mén of Jerusalem,	fréemen of Júdah !
Be judges of my case ⁷	and thát of my víneyard !
4 Could áught have been dóne ?	that í did not dó there ?
⁸ I lóoked for ⁹ (choice) clusters,—	it bóré sour bérries ! ⁸
III 5 I will give you to knów	what I púrpouse to dó : ¹⁰
Awáy with its héddges !	that cáttle may brówse there ; ¹¹
6 A wáste be it hénceforth, ⁹	μ no spáde ever délve it ! ¹²
⁸ The clóuds will I súmmon	to rain on it néver. ^o
IV 7 It is the vineyard of J'HVH, ¹⁰ π	the nátion of Isráel,
The fréemen of Júdah,	His chérished plantátion.
He lóoked for corréctness, ¹¹	but ló ! corrúptness! ¹²
He hóped for cándor, ¹³	but ló ! there is clámor! ¹⁴

(ε) 3 and now (ζ) 4 with my vineyard (η) why (θ) it to bear (ι) 5 and now (κ) with my
 (λ) break dówn¹⁵ its wáll that dówn it be trámpled! [vineyard]
 (μ) 6 it shall not be pruned and (ν) there shall shoot up thorns and briars
 (ξ) on (ο) rain (π) 7 Sabaoth

EXPLANATORY NOTES.

(1) This is the first line of the song. Duhm, Cheyne, Marti, following Ewald, *Propheten*², 1, 306, consider the second line to be the beginning of the poem; they think that the first line is a special introduction, but this view is erroneous.

(2) Lit., on a horn, the son of fatness, *i. e.*, the terraced slope of a mountain exposed to the sun, with rich fertile soil; cf. the Swiss *Matterhorn*, *Schreckhorn*, *Faulhorn*, &c., Lat. *cornu montis*, Greek *κέρας τοῦ ὄφους*. AVM, the horn of the son of oil; but RVM, a horn, the son of oil. Cf. *apertos Bacchus amat colles* (Virgil, *Georg.* 2, 113) quoted by Delitzsch and Orelli.

(3) Of stones, AV: gathered out the stones thereof; *solum elapidavit*, Pliny 17, 30.

(4) See above, p. 197 (2).

(5) Cf. Mark 12,1; Matt. 21,33: A certain man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a place for the wine-vat, and built a tower. This is based on the Septuagintal rendering of our passage, Εγώ καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα, Τότε sepivit eam, et lapides elegit ex illa, §, transposing the two terms, لَعْنَةً مَنْصُورًا he tilled it and made a fence around it. AV translates therefore, *he fenced it*, or (in the margin) *he made a wall about it* instead of *he hoed it*. RV, *he made a trench about it* or (in the margin) *he digged it*. In the neighborhood of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Hebron, &c., there are in almost all the vineyards small round tower-like houses of stone, in which

implements are stored and the keepers housed. The owners live in them during the vintage. Cf. Dillmann-Kittel⁶ (1898) *ad loc.*

(6) Wine-presses and vats, excavated in the solid rock, are common throughout Palestine; see the cut in the translation of Judges, in the *Polychrome Bible*, p. 68.

(7) Supply, *says my friend*. Cf. 2 S 12,5; Matt. 21,40.

(8) There is nothing humorous in the second line of v. 4, as Duhm supposes. The prophet's friend (*i. e.* JHVH) says, I confidently expected good grapes, but my vineyard bore nothing but worthless, small, sour berries. I had a right to expect good grapes after all the trouble I had taken.

(9) Cf. Is. 7,23-25.

(10) Isaiah does not say, My friend is JHVH, and his vineyard is Israel; he simply states, It is the vineyard of JHVH, *i. e.*, the Israelitish nation.

(11) Correctness of life and conduct, rectitude, justice.

(12) Corruption, especially of the judges and other persons in power.

(13) Candor = fairness, impartiality, honesty, righteousness.

(14) Loud complaint of injustice and urgent demand for justice; cf. Exod. 22,22; Gen. 4,10. Dr. Horace Howard Furness, to whom I am indebted for some valuable suggestions, proposes to render the last couplet:

He looked for reason,— but behold! treason;
For men loving duty,— but lo! those loving booty!

This last line might be used for the translation of the last but one line of the Hebrew text. The last line of the poem might be rendered:

He looked for right,— but behold riot!

(so Dr. Marcus Jastrow). We might also use *justice* and *injustice*, *honesty* and *dishonesty*; but *correctness* and *corruptness*, *candor* and *clamor* seem to me preferable.

(15) The Hebrew text uses the infinitive: (I purpose) to break down; so, too, in the preceding double-hemistich, Away with its hedges=(I purpose) to do away with its hedge.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 126 363 1

